

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

714/744 P STREET

OX 942732

S. MENTO, CA 94234-7320



July 17, 1991

Letter No.: 91-64

TO: All County Welfare Directors
All County Administrative Officers

SUBJECT: EDWARDS V. KIZER CLAIMING

Since implementation of the Edwards v. Kizer court order began on January 1, 1990, there have been numerous questions about how counties should report Edwards cases for claiming. Counties are entitled to claim an intake count whenever a determination of ongoing Medi-Cal Only (MCO) eligibility takes place. This is true if the determination was based on information already contained in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children case file or from information supplied via the MC 210E process. NOTE: A face-to-face is not required.

Counties will NOT receive a continuing case count for those cases which are carried as an aid code 38 for an unspecified period of time without a determination of MCO being made. For example, a family is on aid code 38 for three months, there is not enough information in the AFDC case file to make a determination of MCO eligibility, a MC 210E has not been returned, and the county discontinues using term code 38, in accordance with the provisions of All County Welfare Directors Letter #90-06. A continuing case count is not allowed in such situations.

When completing the MC 237 (Caseload Movement and Activity Report - Medical Assistance Only) counties shall include among their total intake count those Edwards cases where a MCO eligibility determination has been completed. Currently, Number 17. of the MC 237 provides a space for counties to identify Edwards cases. This requirement is no longer necessary. Number 17. will be deleted the next time the MC 237 is revised.

If you have any questions, please contact RaNae Dunne of my staff at (916) 324-4955/ATSS 454-4955.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Frank S. Martucci, Chief
Medi-Cal Eligibility Branch

cc: All County Medi-Cal Liaisons
All County Program Consultants